

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 92-CR-80236-DT

FELIX WALLS,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING PENDING MOTIONS

Pending before the court are three motions filed by Defendant Felix Walls. First, on May 23, 2006, Defendant filed a "Motion to Compel Counsel to Supply Documents." The motion seeks relief which the court has denied on several occasions. (See, eg., 1/26/06, 2/23/06, 4/05/06 & 5/02/06 Orders.) For the reasons stated fully in previous orders, Defendant is not entitled to the court-ordered discovery, in the form requested by Defendant, from his attorney, the Government or this court. Moreover, inasmuch as Defendant has recently retained new counsel, Defendant's May 23, 2006 motion is now moot.

Similarly, in Defendant's June 15, 2006 "Motion to Serve Notice of Constitutional Violation and Denial of Rights," Defendant complains that he has not been given copies of various documents and other materials to which he claims he is somehow entitled. Defendant seeks no particular form of relief from this court, but to the extent it can be construed as yet another unavailing motion for discovery, it will be denied.

Finally, on June 1, 2006, this court received a “letter motion” from Defendant, which the clerk of the court filed on June 2, 2006 as a “Motion to Disqualify.” In his “letter motion,” Defendant does not substantively seek to disqualify this court, but rather intimates that “once the evidence surface[s]” this court will lack jurisdiction over this matter or have a conflict of interest related to Defendant. (“Letter Motion” at 2.) No such evidence has “surfaced” or has been submitted by Defendant, and no other basis for disqualification under 28 U.S.C. § 455 has been presented. Defendant also asks that the court “appoint an archivist in order to expedite the research” in this matter. (“Letter Motion” at 2.) Defendant provides no factual or legal support for this unusual request, and the court will therefore deny Defendant’s “letter motion” in its entirety.

For the reasons stated above, IT IS ORDERED that Defendant’s “Motion to Compel Counsel to Supply Documents” [Dkt. # 602], “Motion to Serve Notice of Constitutional Violation and Denial of Rights” [Dkt. # 604] and the June 2, 2006 “letter motion,” docketed as a “Motion to Disqualify,” [Dkt. # 603] are DENIED.

S/Robert H. Cleland
 ROBERT H. CLELAND
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 28, 2006

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, June 28, 2006, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Lisa Wagner
 Case Manager and Deputy Clerk
 (313) 234-5522